



## Miriam Giugni

Early childhood activist educator, Sydney (NSW)



'My point is not that everything is bad, but that everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad. *If everything is dangerous, then we always have something to do.* So my position leads not to apathy but to. . . activism' (Foucault, 1983, pp. 231–2).

For me, becoming an activist early childhood educator hasn't been a move from one way of being to another (i.e. advocate to activist), but instead an ongoing process of 'becoming' because there is 'always something to do'.

The 'always something to do' in my worlds focus on re-imagining how early childhood education could be conceptualised and practised. This means that I am always looking at what is happening in my practice and drawing on many different theorists to deliberately question the extent to which it seems equitable. Sometimes I am looking at pedagogies and curriculum making, and at other times I am looking at frameworks (such as the National Quality Framework). In all cases I am thinking through the *politics* of what has produced early childhood pedagogies, curriculum making practices and frameworks. Thinking through the politics for me means identifying the discourses through which pedagogies, curriculum making practices and frameworks have been produced. When I see the politics of a situation in new ways I can begin to re-imagine 'what else' and 'how else' early childhood education can potentially become (Giugni, 2010).

One example that I have grappled with for a number of years is the ways in which regulatory and quality frameworks are mostly produced in and through dominant Western discourses of early childhood. For example, the persistent focus on 'the individual child' and how she/he develops is at the centre of how we construct 'the child'. I always think this is dangerous, because it does not necessarily fit every child. Because I live and work in 'Australia', I have a strong view that any kind of knowledge system should always begin with *principles* of an Aboriginal world view. How then might early childhood right across Australia look different if colonial knowledges were put aside and Aboriginal knowledges framed our everyday pedagogies and practices? It seems that in current regulatory and quality documents that we (non-Aboriginal) are satisfied to 'include' an Aboriginal perspective (and I often ask how we do that as non-Aboriginal peoples) because we are in control of how it happens and we can make it appear palatable. But if we extended our commitment to 'inclusion' and re-imagined the whole early childhood system through an Aboriginal world view, what politics might then arise? What might shift in terms of power and knowledge, expertise and culture?

Becoming activist is not a fixed way to live life, but rather an ongoing grappling with the politics that produce how we live and work in early childhood.